

REMARKS

In response to the Office action dated October 2, 2006, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the above claim amendments and the following remarks. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-36 are pending in the present Application. Claims 14-28 have been previously withdrawn. Claims 1, 29 and 31 have been amended, leaving Claims 1-13 and 29-36 for consideration upon entry of the present amendments and following remarks.

Support for the amendments to the claims can at least be found in the specification, the figures, and the claims as originally filed.

No new matter has been introduced by these amendments. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Claim Objections

Claim 31 stands objected to for informalities. The Examiner states that the limitation “the first connector” lacks antecedent basis. The Examiner suggests that the limitation be amended to read “the connector” as identified in base claim 29. Claim 29 has been amended to recite “a first connector” rendering the objection thereto moot.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 29-32 and 35-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by Ishida et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,057,678, hereinafter “Ishida”). The Examiner states that Ishida discloses all of the elements of the abovementioned claims, primarily in FIG. 1, column 1, lines 43 and 64-65 and column 2, lines 6-19. Applicants respectfully traverse.

To anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102, a single source must contain all of the elements of the claim. *Lewmar Marine Inc. v. Bariant, Inc.*, 827 F.2d 744, 747, 3 U.S.P.Q.2d 1766, 1768 (Fed. Cir. 1987), *cert. denied*, 484 U.S. 1007 (1988). Moreover, the single source must disclose all of the claimed elements “arranged as in the claim.” *Structural Rubber Prods. Co. v. Park Rubber Co.*, 749 F.2d 707, 716, 223 U.S.P.Q. 1264, 1271 (Fed. Cir. 1984).

It is respectfully submitted that Ishida discloses the solder 28b electrically connecting the first electrode of only one lamp 27 to an inverter (refer to FIG. 1 and column 2, lines 15-19 of Ishida). In contrast, the present invention includes the first connector electrically connecting the first electrodes that are coupled to the first board to an inverter as recited in amended independent claims 1 and 29.

More specifically, Ishida does not teach or suggest a first board that makes contact with the first lamp holder, the first board having a flat plate shape and being coupled to first electrodes of the lamps to provide the first electrodes with the first discharge voltage, the first electrode extending through the first board to an opposite surface thereof; and a first connector installed on the first board to electrically connect the first electrodes that are coupled to the first board to an inverter that generates the first discharge voltage, as in amended independent Claims 1 and 29. Thus, Claims 1 and 29, including claims depending therefrom, i.e., Claims 2-13 and 30-36, define over Ishida.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of Claims 1, 29-32 and 35-36 under § 102(e) be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2-5, 7-11 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Ishida in view of Mazis (U.S. Patent No. 4,504,891, hereinafter “Mazis”). Applicants respectfully traverse.

For an obviousness rejection to be proper, the Examiner must meet the burden of establishing that all elements of the invention are disclosed in the prior art and that the prior art relied upon, coupled with knowledge generally available in the art at the time of the invention, must contain some suggestion or incentive that would have motivated the skilled artisan to modify a reference or combined references. *In re Fine*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *In Re Wilson*, 165 U.S.P.Q. 494, 496 (C.C.P.A. 1970); *Amgen v. Chugai Pharmaceuticals Co.*, 927 U.S.P.Q.2d, 1016, 1023 (Fed. Cir. 1996).

It is respectfully noted that Claims 2-5, 7-11 and 13 depend from Claim 1, which is submitted as being allowable for defining over Ishida as discussed above. Further, it is respectfully submitted that use of the first board disclosed in Mazis does not cure the deficiencies

noted above with respect to Ishida. The Examiner also suggests that Oyokota – JP2002132193A teaches a second board coupled to the second electrode for providing the second electrode with the second discharge voltage on the opposite side as allegedly disclosed in FIG. 1 of Oyokota. Likewise, it is respectfully submitted that use of second board disclosed in Oyokota does not cure the deficiencies noted above with respect to Ishida.

Neither Ishida nor Mazis, either alone or in combination, teach or suggest, a first board that makes contact with the first lamp holder, the first board having a flat plate shape and being coupled to first electrodes of the lamps to provide the first electrodes with the first discharge voltage, the first electrode extending through the first board to an opposite surface thereof; and a first connector installed on the first board to electrically connect the first electrodes that are coupled to the first board to an inverter that generates the first discharge voltage, . . . the first electrode extending through the first board to an opposite surface thereof; and . . . at least two first through-holes formed on the first insulated body, each of the first through-holes receiving the first electrode of each of the lamps, as in Claim 2. Thus, Claim 2, including claims depending therefrom, i.e., Claims 3-5, define over Ishida in view of Mazis.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishida in view of Mazis and further in view of Saito, U.S. Patent No. 6,441,874 (hereinafter “Saito”) as applied to Claim 1, and Claims 8-11 are rejected over Ishida as applied to Claim 7 above (which limitations are included in Claim 1, as amended), all further in view of Mazis. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishida as applied to Claim 7 above (which limitations are included in Claim 1, as amended), and further in view of Mazis in view of Saito. Claims 33 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishida as applied to Claim 29 above, and in further in view of Saito. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Dependent claims inherit all of the limitations of the respective parent claim.

Claims 6, 8-12, 33 and 34 variously depend from Claims 1 and 29. As discussed above, Ishida and Mazis do not teach or suggest, either alone or in combination, at least all of the limitations of at least amended Claims 1 and 29. Saito also does not teach at least all of the limitations of amended Claims 1 and 29. Therefore, Saito does not remedy the deficiencies of

Ishida and Mazis with respect to amended Claims 1 and 29. Accordingly, Ishida, Mazis and Saito do not teach all of the limitations of Claims 6, 8-12, 33 and 34.

Since Ishida, Mazis and Saito, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest all of the limitations of at least Claims 6, 8-12, 33 and 34, *prima facie* obviousness does not exist regarding Claims 6, 8-12, 33 and 34 with respect to the Ishida, Mazis and Saito patents.

Additionally, since Ishida, Mazis and Saito fail to teach or suggest all of the limitations of Claims 6, 8-12, 33 and 34, clearly, one of ordinary skill at the time of Applicants' invention would not have a motivation to modify or combine the references, or a reasonable likelihood of success in forming the claimed invention by modifying or combining the references. Thus, here again, *prima facie* does not exist.

Thus, *prime facie* obviousness does not exist regarding Claims 6, 8-12, 33 and 34 with respect to the Ishida, Mazis and Saito patents. Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 6, 8-12, 33 and 34 are not further rejected or objected and are therefore allowable. Reconsideration and allowance of Claims 6, 8-12, 33 and 34 is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the instant application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this application be allowed and a Notice of Allowance issued. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicants' attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is cordially requested to telephone the undersigned.

In the event the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks deems additional fees to be due in connection with this application, Applicants' attorney hereby authorizes that such fee be charged to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By: /James J. Merrick/
James J. Merrick
Reg. No. 43,801
Confirmation No. 2199
CANTOR COLBURN LLP
55 Griffin Road South
Bloomfield, CT 06002
PTO Customer No. 23413
Telephone (860) 286-2929
Facsimile (860) 286-0115

Date: April 2, 2007